

20th August 1925]

*Alleged grievances of unpassed men in service.*

\* 186 Q.—Mr. J. A. SALDANHA : Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to refer to the debates in Volume XXIII, page 1050 et seq. on my amendment as to the grievances of unpassed men affected by certain Government orders and state—

(a) what is the total of the increments drawn by unpassed clerks after March 1923 which were held by Government to have been wrongly given in the several departments ;

(b) whether any clerks in the offices under the control of the Collectors of South Kanara and Malabar were made to refund the increments so drawn ;

(c) if so, what was the total amount ; and

(d) what orders Government have passed on my amendment as well as the resolution as amended, which were both carried (Volume XXIII, page 1073) ?

A.—(a) The Government have not the information.

(b) In memorials received from certain unpassed clerks in the South Kanara and Malabar districts, it is stated that increments drawn by them have been recovered from them. Government have no other information on the point.

(c) The Government have no information.

(d) The hon. Member is referred to the statement of resolutions passed by the Council and the action taken on them by the Government. The statement has been laid on the table of the House.

Mr. R. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—“ Sir, with reference to clause (d), a statement is said to have been laid on the table. We have not received any statement at all nor can we find any statement laid on the table of this House. May I ask, if it has not been already laid on the table, it may be done so now ? ”

The hon. Mr. N. E. MARJORIBANKS :—“ The statement has not been laid on the table, but it will be shortly placed there. The information was communicated to the Council Office and I hope it will, in due course, be laid on the table.”

Mr. R. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—“ Am I to understand that it will be laid on the table shortly ? ”

The hon. Mr. N. E. MARJORIBANKS :—“ I presume so, Sir.”

**Court of Wards and Zamindars.**

*The Panchalankurichi zamindari.*

\* 187 Q.—Mr. A. CHIDAMBARA NADAR : Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether there was any order of the Government at the time when the Panchalankurichi zamindari in Tinnevely district was taken up by the Government that it should be given back to the descendants of the deposed zamindar after 100 years ;

(b) if so, the reason for not acting upon the order ;

(c) whether any petition was submitted to the Government by the descendants of the original zamindar ;



[20th August 1925]

(d) if so, the order passed by the Government on the petition; and  
 (e) the allowance paid now to the descendants of the deposed zamindar?

A.—(a) No.  
 (b) Does not arise.  
 (c) Yes.  
 (d) It was rejected.  
 (e) Rupees 50 per mensem.

MR. A. CHIDAMBARA NADAR :—“With reference to clause (c), may I know the chief grounds in the petition for claiming the zamindari by the descendants of the zamindar?”

The hon. Mr. N. E. MARJORIBANKS :—“I must ask for notice. It was a long time ago that the correspondence took place and I am afraid I have not studied it.”

MR. A. CHIDAMBARA NADAR :—“Is there any recent petition put in by the descendants of the zamindar?”

The hon. Mr. N. E. MARJORIBANKS :—“As far as I know, the last correspondence closed about 1912. The correspondence took place between the years 1908 and 1912.”

MR. A. CHIDAMBARA NADAR :—“May I know whether any documents were produced along with the petition showing the petitioners' title to the property?”

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“The hon. Member has replied that he does not remember any correspondence after 1912. That means he will apparently look into it hereafter.”

MR. A. CHIDAMBARA NADAR :—“I will confine myself to the correspondence between 1908–1912.”

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“The hon. Member says that he has no information and that he cannot recollect it.”

THE RAJA OF RAMNAD :—“With reference to clause (d), it is stated that the petition was rejected. May I know if it was rejected for the only reason that there was no right as claimed by the petitioners or for any other reasons?”

The hon. Mr. N. E. MARJORIBANKS :—“The petition was rejected successively by this Government, by the Government of India and by the Secretary of State. I do not think these authorities set forth their reasons for rejecting it.”

#### General.

*Management of certain factories and properties belonging to the Basel Mission.*

\* 188 Q.—MR. J. A. SALDANHA : Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) what authority and control is exercised by the Local Government over the management by the Commonwealth Trust of certain factories and properties belonging to the Basel Mission; and

(b) what is the interest, if any, of the British Government in the said factories and properties?

A.—(a) & (b) None.